

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 39-42, 44, 46-64, and 77-98 were pending and examined in the June 6, 2003 Office Action. Claims 39-42, 47-64, and 77-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for alleged lack of enablement. Claims 39-42, 44, 46-64, and 77-98 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly obvious variants of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,284,944. Claims 44 and 46 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 39-42, 47-64, 77, 79-83, and 85-98 will be pending in the application. Claims 39-42, 47-52, 57-60, 77, 79-83, 85-92, and 97-98 are amended herein. Claims 44, 46, 78, and 84 are canceled herein. No new matter has been introduced by way of the aforementioned amendments.

**A. Claims 39-42, 47-64, 77, 79-83, and 85-98 are enabled by the specification.**

Claims 39-42, 47-64, and 77-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for alleged lack of enablement. Applicants disagree with the rejection for the reasons of record. Nonetheless, in an effort to facilitate prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended the claims to recite the enabled mouse. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

**B. Claims 44 and 46 have been rewritten in allowable independent form.**

Claims 44 and 46 are objected to as dependent upon rejected base claims 39 and 40, respectively. Although Applicants disagree with the basis for rejecting base claims 39 and 40, the claim limitations of claims 44 and 46 have been incorporated into amended base

claims 39 and 40, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

**C. The rejection for obviousness-type double patenting is moot in light of the terminal disclaimer filed herewith.**

Claims 39-42, 44, 46-64, and 77-98 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,284,924 taken with U.S. Patent No. 5,898,094 and claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,003. Preliminarily, Applicants note that U.S. Patent No. 6,284,924 is irrelevant to the present analysis. Applicants submit that the correct number of the commonly assigned patent asserted as the basis for the rejection is previously cited U.S. Patent No. 6,284,944.

Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 6,284,944. Thus, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments submitted herein and the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that all presently pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request early and favorable action on the application and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the June 6, 2003 Office Action. In addition, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.


**DOCKET NO.:** CEPH-1066  
**Application No.:** 09/621,897  
**Office Action Dated:** June 6, 2003

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 215-557-5908.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 3, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Felicity E. Groth  
Registration No. 47,042

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439

**Attachments**

Terminal Disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 6,284,944  
Associate Power of Attorney